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CAScr (https://github.com/Tooni/CAScript-Artifact)
A tool chain for

- top-down choreographic development
- validating protocols via choreography automata
- TypeScript web programming via API generation

Check out our paper or get in touch for details...

## - Prologue -

Choreographies, informally ]
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What about payloads?

## Top-down model-driven development
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## - Act I -

[ Choreography Automata ]

## Our global \& local specs

Choreography automata: Interaction, globally


## Our global \& local specs

Intermediate automata: from interactions to communications


Communicating finite-state machines: Communication, locally

$$
\operatorname{proj}(M, \text { vendor })=\longrightarrow Q_{4} \longrightarrow Q_{5} \longrightarrow Q_{\text {c v?reject }}^{\text {wv?loginOK }}
$$

Internal step: $S \xrightarrow{\leftrightharpoons} S$ $\qquad$

Intermal step: $S \stackrel{s}{\rightarrow} S$ $\qquad$



## Projections preserve semantics

Theorem. Choreography automata are bisimilar to their projections
$\Longrightarrow$ traces equivalence
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## Selective participation in OLW



- at $q_{2}$ wallet and customer aware from the very beginning
- vendor involved on one branch only, but that's fine: wallet is aware
- at $q_{6}$ wallet and customer aware from the very beginning
- vendor eventually informed by customer on each branch


## Theorems

## Correctness by construction

Theorem. Projections of well-formed choreography automata are deadlock-free

Theorem. Projections of well-formed choreography automata are lock-free

## - Act II -

[ Asserted Choreography Automata ]

## DbC vs. choreography automata
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## Consistency

- history senesitiveness: in $q \underset{\mathrm{~A}}{\vec{\lambda}} q^{\prime}$, A predicates on known variables
- temporal satisfiability: the conjunction of the predicates on a path is satisfiable
- well-formedness of the underlying choreography automaton


## Theorems

## Projections are a bit more complicated than for choreography automata

## On consistent asserted choreography automata

Theorem. Asserted choreography automata are weakly bisimilar to their projections
$\Longrightarrow$ trace equivalence

Theorem. Projections of well-formed asserted choreography automata are deadlock-free

## - Act III -

[CAScr ]

## Architecture of CAScr
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## Multiparty global types

Syntax
$G \quad::=\sum_{i \in I} \mathrm{p} \rightarrow \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{i}}: \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{i}} ; G_{i} \quad \mu \mathrm{r} . G \quad \mathrm{r} \quad$ end
Semantics

$$
\sum_{i \in I} \mathrm{p} \rightarrow \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{i}}: \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{i}} ; G_{i} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{p} \rightarrow \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}}: \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{j}}} G_{j}(j \in I)
$$

$$
\frac{G[\mu \mathrm{r} \cdot G / \mathrm{r}] \stackrel{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} G^{\prime}}{\mu \mathrm{r} \cdot G \stackrel{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} G^{\prime}}
$$

From global types to choreography automata
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From global types to choreography automata


CAScr

- computes the mapping above
- checks well-formedness of the resulting choreography automaton
- generates the TypeScript API of each participant

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { - Epilogue - } \\
{[\ldots]}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Summing up

## Choreography Automata (with assertions)

A theory of choreographies

- with increased expressiveness
- supporting DbC
- providing a basis for (enhanced) tool support for TypeScript web programming


## Plans

- Consider asynchronous communications
- Applications:
- inferring a (local) models from APIs and
- checking their conformance against projections of a global spec
[ Thank you! ]

